Remarks/Arguments

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 8, 2003. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1-4 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4.

I. SUMMARY OF EXAMINER'S REJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Brown* et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,887,133).

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown* et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,887,133).

II. SUMMARY OF APPLICANTS' AMENDMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-4.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 3 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Brown*. Applicants respectfully submit that *Brown* does not disclose every limitation of Claims 1 and 3, and therefore, cannot anticipate Claims 1 and 3.

Brown describes a system in which a portion of a document such as an advertisement on a web page can be selected. This portion of the document can then be replaced by a message or advertisement which roughly fits into the position of the removed section.

This is significantly different from claims 1 and 3 of the present application. Claims 1 and 3 state that a new rendition includes the identified section. In the *Brown* reference, the opposite occurs. An identified section is removed from a new rendition in the system of the *Brown* reference. For this reason, claims 1 and 3 are believed to be allowable.

Additionally, reformatting in the *Brown* reference is not believed to be done with respect to a characteristic of a specific class of devices. The original and revised document in the *Brown* reference are both formatted for a computer monitor or TV set. Thus, no reformatting needs to be done based upon a characteristic of a specific class of devices. For this additional reason, claims 1 and 3 are believed to be allowable.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown* et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,887,133).

Claims 2 and 4 each depend on independent Claims 1 and 3 respectively, and are therefore at least patentable for the reasons mentioned above.

Thus, since *Brown* fails to teach or suggest each of the limitations of Claims 2 and 4, Claims 2 and 4 cannot be obvious over *Brown*. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of Claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown* as applied to Claims 1 and 3 is requested.

VI. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is

respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/7/03

By: _____

Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800